

over Nakano in view of Wachi and further in view of Yasunori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,619). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

In particular, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a flat display apparatus having a flat display panel that includes an optical filter attached to a display screen surface of the flat display panel by a transparent adhesive material, the optical filter being formed by laminating an ambient light antireflective layer, an infrared-radiation absorbing and color-tone correcting layer and an electromagnetic-wave blocking layer, wherein the transparent adhesive material has an adhesive strength of 3 kgf/inch or less when being vertically detached, as recited in independent claim 23.

Nakano teaches a filter for an electronic display having at least one minimum value of transmittance in a visible light wavelength range of 400-700 nm (Abstract). Nakano further teaches that when a 30-micrometer thick polyester film is stuck on a 3 mm-thick glass sheet with a 30-micrometer-thick adhesive, the adhesive shows the 180-degree peeling strength after holding for 10 days at 80° C of 300 g/cm, preferably 400 g/cm (emphasis added, paragraph [0316]). The Office Action appears to use this portion of Nakano to determine that the subject matter of claim 23, and especially the feature in the claim of “the transparent adhesive material has an adhesive strength of 3 kgf or less when being vertically detached,” reads on this paragraph. However, the Patent Office is mistaken for the following reasons.

As already argued during the Response filed on April 4, 2007 and for which the Patent Office did not provide a counter argument, Nakano teaches a “180-degree peeling,” in contrast with the claimed transparent adhesive material being vertically

detached. The drawing provided with the April 4, 2007, Response illustrates very clearly the differences between Nakano and the claimed invention. In particular, the fact that Nakano's 180° peeling strength pulls the adhesive material horizontally and in parallel to the substrate surface, while the claimed invention pulls the adhesive material vertically and perpendicularly to the surface of the glass sheet. The significance of this difference resides in the fact that the physical attributes of an adhesive layer having a particular strength against peeling a surface in a 180° fashion, or in a direction horizontal and parallel to the surface of the substrate, are very different from the attributes of a layer against peeling the adhesive material perpendicularly or vertically from the surface of the substrate because both types of peeling require different peeling strength characteristics. Thus, Nakano fails to specifically claim the feature of the adhesive material of a certain strength or less when being vertically detached, as recited in independent claim 23. Furthermore, as discussed above, Nakano's 180° peeling strength is also non-obvious over the claimed vertical detachment peeling strength of the adhesive material.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. Because claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano, and because Nakano fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 23, and in particular the feature of the adhesive material of a certain strength or less when being vertically detached, independent claim 23 is patentable over Nakano.

Yoshikawa teaches an electromagnetic-wave shielding material, such as a conductive mesh member bonded to a front surface of a PDP body by transparent

adhesives and a transparent base plate bonded to a surface of the electromagnetic-wave shielding material so that they are integrated together (Abstract), but fails to cure deficiencies in Nakano in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claims 16, 18 and 19, including the above-discussed features of independent claim 23.

Wachi teaches a flat display panel comprising a flat display panel main body and a front protective plate which comprises an antireflection layer, a translucent electrically conductive layer, and a highly rigid transparent substrate (Abstract), and fails to cure deficiencies in Nakano in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claims 9-11, including the above-discussed features of independent claim 23.

Yasunori teaches a front panel for a plasma display panel having at least one transparent resin plate and a conductive mesh placed on the transparent resin plate in which a part of the conductive mesh is exposed on the plate in a sheet form on at least one side of the marginal surface of the front panel (Abstract), and fails to cure deficiencies in Nakano and Wachi in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of claims 12-14, including the above-discussed features of independent claim 23.

For at least these reasons, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 23. Thus, independent claim 23 is patentable over Nakano.

Claims 3-5, 7, 9-20 and 24, at least for their dependence on patentable claim 23, and for their added limitations, are also patentable over a combination of all the applied references.

For at least these reasons, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of the pending claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing **Attorney Dkt. No. 107156-00216**.

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration Number 55,478

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN/cvd